ᔆ

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,479	01/30/2002	Jim Pruyne	10006791-1	3529

7590 03/21/2007		EXAMINER
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY		NAWAZ, ASAD M
Intellectual Property Administration		

	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P. O. Box 272400	2155	
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400		

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
2 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

MAILED

MAR 2 1 2007

Technology Center 2100

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/066,479
Filing Date: January 30, 2002
Appellant(s): PRUYNE ET AL.

Hewlett-Packard Company
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 12/02/06 appealing from the Office action

mailed 10/25/05.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6259709   Shur et al   7-2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 24-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shur et al

(USPN: 6259701) hereinafter referred to as Shur.

As to claim 24, Shur teaches a method for performing a web transaction,

comprising:

obtaining a form that includes a unique identifier for the web transaction (col 4,

lines 41-64);

initiating a database update and generating a log for the database update such

that the log is identified by the unique identifier (col 5, lines 21-65);

obtaining a request to reload a status page such that the request includes the

unique identifier (col 5, lines 21-65);

accessing the log in response to the request and retrying the database update if

the log indicates a failure of the database update such that the database update is

performed at most once (col 5, lines 21-65).

As to claim 25, Shur teaches the method of claim 24, wherein obtaining a form

comprises: obtaining the form in a post command from a client and providing the status

page to the client in response to the post command such that the status page includes

the unique identifier (col 5, lines 57 to col 6, line 3).

As to claim 26, Shur teaches the method of claim 25, wherein the request to

reload is automatically generated by the status page at the client. (col 5, lines 57 to col

6, line 3)

As to claim 27, Shur teaches the method of claim 25, wherein the request to

reload is manually generated at the client (col 5, lines 21-65; once the client resubmits

the erroneous form).

As to claim 28, Shur teaches the method of claim 25, reload includes a set of ·

data for update wherein the request to retrying the database (col 5, lines 31-65; the

numerous fields, session ids, etc.).

As to claim 29, Shur teaches the method of claim 24, further comprising storing a

set of data for retrying the database update (col 5, lines 31-65; the numerous fields,

session ids, etc.).

As to claim 30, Shur teaches the method of claim 24, wherein retrying the

database update includes rolling back the database update after a timeout period and

then retrying the database update.(col 6, lines 15-41)

As to claim 31, Shur teaches the method of claim 30, further comprising

determining the timeout period in response to a timestamp contained in the status

page.(col 5, lines 49-57)

Claims 32-45 are essentially the processing system and the transaction system

of the above-mentioned method claims.

(10) Response to Argument

The examiner summarizes the various points raised by the appellant and

addresses them individually. It is noted, however, the appellants have severely

misunderstood and misconstrued the examiner's rejection of the claims. The examiner

has made his best attempt in completely addressing the appellant's arguments despite

the arguments being based upon a misrepresentation of the prior art applied.

As per appellant's arguments filed 12/02/06, the appellant argues:

Shur does not teach a form (see Brief, page 11—Argument A)

In response to A) the examiner reiterates the appellant's misrepresentation of

Shur especially regarding equation of the list of sessions to a form. Shur clearly and

definitely teaches the filling of multiple forms. For example, an initial form is used to

initiate a session between the client and the server wherein a login id and a password

are used (col 4, lines 52-56). Thereafter, a session with the server is created in which

the login id is used as a unique identifier for the transactions. In fact, files associated

with the session are indexed using the login id (col 5, lines 60-63). Furthermore,

another form is presented to the client in which the client can create/update/edit a Multi-

cast session. This for requires the input of numerous fields such as ports, Time to Live

values, name and phone number of administrating party, duration, etc (col 5, lines 31-
65).

Shur does not disclose a form includes a unique identifier for a web transaction
(see Brief, page 11—Argument B)

In response to B), it should be noted that once again the appellants have

misrepresented the examiner's rejection in arguing that a list of Multicast session does

not include a login id/password. It should also be noted that at the packet level, once a

session is created, a session identifier is always sent with each packet. Nevertheless,

the login id that is used to index files is also associated with the forms for initial

authentication, creation, updating, and editing (col 5, lines 60-63). The examiner

asserts that the claims are broad and should thus be interpreted as such. So in view of

the broadest reasonable interpretation, it should be realized that even the initial

authentication in which the client supplies the login id, qualifies as a satisfactory citation

for the claimed limitation (col 5, lines 33-35).

Shur does not teach reloading a status page (see Brief, page12—Argument C)

In response to C), the claim does not require that a status page is reloaded,

rather simply a request to reload is required. Once the client initially authenticates to

the server, the client is presented with a page containing a list of sessions (col 5, lines

33-37). The request to create/update/edit a multicast session initiates a request for an

updated status page of all active sessions. If successful, the database is flittered and

converted into an HTML page (col 6, lines 10-31). Because the list of Multicast

sessions was previously presented to the user, a re-presentation of the same list would

qualify as a reloading. The appellant's arguments that an error message is not a status

page and it is not reloaded are moot as the examiner never equated those elements of

Shur to the claimed limitations in question.

Shur does not teach that the request itself includes the unique identifier for the

web transaction (see Brief, page 12—Argument D)

In response, the appellant's are directed to similar arguments that were

previously addressed. It should be clear that when a user requests a copy of the page

containing Multicast sessions, the request must contain proper authenticators, such as

a session id (as is well known in the art). Otherwise, the client has to repeatedly

authenticate and re-authenticate to the server. Furthermore, Shur is clear that each

request contains the associated login id, as it is used to index data for the given session

request (col 6, lines 10-31). Again, the appellant's arguments that error message does

not include the login ID is disregarded.

Shur does not disclose retrying the database update if the log indicates a failure

of the database update such that the database update is performed at most once (see

Brief, page 13—Argument E)

In response to E), Shur teaches that the form must be properly filled out. If the

form is not properly filled out it would be recorded in the log as such and the database

would not be updated as the request for creation/updating/editing session will not be

entered. Rather, the server returns the non-compliant form to the client along with an

error message. Upon re-completion of the form, the server again checks for

compliance. If the form is correct, then the database update is performed exactly once

(col 5, lines 20-65).

Shur does not disclose rolling back the database update after a timeout period

and then retrying the database update (see Brief, page 15—Argument F)

In response to F), it should be noted that the rolling back to a state can only

occur if the database state had changed. Because the claim requires at most once

updating, there would be no reason to roll back form an error state. Furthermore, it

should be noted that this is a basic security feature that is well known in the art

especially in the case when sessions timeout. Nevertheless, Shur teaches a timeout

mechanism specified by the client for a multicast session and a timeout mechanism that

relies upon when a last query/response was received from the client for the system (col

5, lines 16-20 and col 6, lines 1-3). Therefore, Shur meets the scope of the limitations

as currently claimed.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the

Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Asad M. Nawaz

Conferees:

SPE Saleh Najjar

Appeals Specialist Lynne Browne

Lynne H. Browne
Appeal Specialist, TQAS
Technology Center 2100

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER